DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 092 FL 021 658

AUTHOR Grossman, Herbert
TITLE The San Jose State University Bilingual/Multicultural Special Education Personnel Preparation Program: A Report on Thirteen Years of Experience.
INSTITUTION San Jose State Univ., Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 92
NOTE 52p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Advocacy; *Bilingual Education; Classroom Techniques; College Faculty; Counseling; Cultural Awareness; *Disabilities; Early Childhood Education; Educational Technology; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Graduate Study; Higher Education; Intercollegiate Cooperation; Language Proficiency; Language Skills; *Multicultural Education; Program Descriptions; Program Design; Program Evaluation; Second Language Instruction; *Special Education; Student Characteristics; Student Evaluation; Summer Programs; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS San Jose State University CA

ABSTRACT

The report describes the San Jose State University (California) teacher education program to prepare teachers of multicultural special education in elementary and secondary schools. It begins by describing the program's components, all related to bilingual special education teacher training: the training program itself; teacher certification; an 8-course advanced training program; distance education; intercollegiate credit transfer; multicultural training for monolingual teachers; multicultural training for teachers trained in learning disabilities; early childhood education; English-as-a-Second-Language instruction; and summer institutes. Other program information reported includes student and faculty data, a history of the program's development since 1979, program structure, courses offered, and descriptions of the bilingual/multicultural competencies emphasized, with program activities used to teach them. These include: language skills; cultural awareness and intercultural skills; non-discriminatory assessment techniques; language assessment techniques; instructional strategies; counseling, consultation, advocacy, and referral skills; and classroom management techniques. A formal program evaluation for the program's 13-year period, with recommendations, is appended. (MSE)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 364 092

# The San Jose State University Bilingual/Multicultural Special Education Personnel Preparation Program: A Report on Thirteen Years of Experience

Herbert Grossman, Ph.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

November, 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL024658

# THE SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL PREPARATION PROGRAM: A REPORT ON THIRTEEN YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Herbert Grossman Ph. D.

This report is being disseminated by the the Bilingual/Multicultural Emphases of the Division of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services of San Jose State University in accordance with a personnel preparation grant received from the U. S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs. The report reflects the opinions and recollections of its author and no one else. However, many individuals have been associated with and contributed toward the development of the bilingual/multicultural special education program.

The original program development grant was prepared by Gilbert Guerin and Alba Ortiz. Faculty members of the program have included:

| | |
|---|---|
| Chinese Emphasis: | Bertha Du-Babcock, Diana Kouch, Hilda Mann |
| Pilipino Emphasis: | Aimee Anaya, Lydia Gorrez, Maria Luisa Querubin Villongco |
| Portuguese Emphasis: | Isabel Cabral-Johnson, Heraldo da Silva, Marta Grady-Costa, Jerry Powell, George Schornick, Maria de Lourdes Serpa, George Sousa |
| Spanish Emphasis: | Candice Clark, Minerva Galvan, Herbert Grossman, Cuca Hepburn, Janette Klingner, Henriette Langdon, Lee Ann Laraway, Elba Maldonado-Colon, Zaida McCall-Perez, Susan Meyers, Irene Nares-Guzicki, Evelyn Ortiz-Stanley, Rose Payan, Fred Perez, Jose Rodriguez, George Schornick, Diane Torres-Raborn |
| Vietnamese Emphasis: | Mai Dao, Minh Ngoc Ta |
| Multicultural Emphasis: | Mary Bacon, Mai Dao, Herbert Grossman, Elba Maldonado-Colon, Irene Nares-Guzicki |

In addition to the above named faculty members, many other individuals participated in the program as faculty members in the various summer Institutes offered by the program and as lecturers in courses offered during the regular academic year.

# Additional Information

Please contact the following faculty members for additional information about the various components of the bilingual/multicultural special education program. They all can be reached at the following address and phone number:

Bilingual/Multicultural Special Education Program
Division of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
San Jose State University
One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0078
(408) 924-3692

| | |
|---|---|
| Bilingual Special Education | Dr. Herbert Grossman or<br>Dr. Elba Maldonado-Colon |
| Chinese Emphasis | Dr. Diana Sun Kouch |
| Pilipino Emphasis | Dr. Aimee A. Anaya |
| Portuguese Emphasis | Dr. Heraldo da Silva |
| Spanish Emphasis | Dr. Elba Maldonado-Colon |
| Vietnamese Emphasis | Ms. Mai Dao |
| Program Products | Ms. Guadalupe Lopes |
| Bilingual Learning Handicapped | Dr. Herbert Grossman or<br>Dr. Elba Maldonado-Colon |
| Bilingual Severely Handicapped | Dr. Herbert Grossman |
| Bilingual Communication Disorders | Dr. Elba Maldonado-Colon |
| Multicultural Special Education | Dr. Herbert Grossman |
| ITFS | Dr. Herbert Grossman or<br>Ms. Irene Nares-Guzicki |

# Introduction

The bilingual/multicultural special education program of the Division of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (SERS) at San Jose State University (SJSU), one of the oldest and largest programs of its kind in the United States, has been preparing special educators to work with culturally and linguistically different handicapped students since 1979. From a program which consisted of two Spanish speaking bilingual faculty members, it has grown into a program with eleven bilingual and numerous monolingual faculty members who prepare professionals to work with communicatively disordered and learning handicapped students from many different cultural/linguistic backgrounds. The following is a description of the various components that have been offered as part of the program.

# Program Components

1. Bilingual Special Education Emphases

The bilingual/multicultural special education program prepares special educators and speech and language therapists who speak a Chinese or Pilipino dialect or Spanish or Vietnamese to work with limited English proficient learning handicapped and communicatively handicapped students. Trainees have a number of program options to choose from.

A. Credential Program

Trainees enrolled in this program complete a course of study leading to a special education credential and a certificate of competency in bilingual special education. Trainees in this program typically enroll in from eight to fifteen courses taught in English and five to six courses taught in their target languages (TL's), depending on their area of concentration and TL's. To be eligible for this program, trainees must have a regular teaching credential or an undergraduate speech major, and be fluent in both English and their TL.

B. Advanced Training Program

Credentialed special educators and speech and language specialists who want additional training in working with culturally and linguistically different students may enroll in the bilingual special education core courses which typically consist of two courses taught in English and six courses taught in the trainees' TL. Trainees receive a certificate of competency in bilingual special education upon completion of the program.

C. Interactive Television Fixed System (ITFS)

While most trainees in the program take courses on campus, trainees who work and/or live in areas that are beyond commuting distance to the campus can complete the Hispanic learning handicapped program at five community colleges and local school district sites through an interactive television fixed system (ITFS). Trainees enroll in eleven courses broadcasted in English and Spanish to these sites. In addition, an off-campus faculty member teaches three one-unit courses in Spanish at these sites, supervises trainees' practica, and meets regularly with students to enrich the courses taught over television and to provide advisement and all the other services that students normally obtain on campus. A mini resource center containing professional books and articles and instructional, assessment and counseling materials in both English and Spanish is maintained at each site. Thus, these trainees can complete all aspects of the Hispanic learning handicapped program off-campus.

D. Interuniversity Program

Because there are no other bilingual special education programs in northern California, trainees who live and/or work outside of both the university and ITFS service areas may enroll in an interuniversity program. Trainees take the bilingual special education core courses through SJSU either on campus or off campus and the regular special education courses at their local universities.

2. Multicultural Special Education Emphases

SJSU offers a variety of programs for monolingual educators who wish to work with culturally and linguistically different students with special needs. While all training programs offered by the Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation include multicultural competencies, the Division has received a number of grants in recent years to infuse multicultural competencies into specific special programs.

A. Multicultural Learning Handicapped Program

SJSU received a three year grant (1986-1989) to infuse multicultural competencies in all of the courses in the program to prepare special educators to work with learning handicapped students. As a result, trainees who enroll in the learning handicapped program are prepared to work with students from different cultural backgrounds.

B. Multicultural Early Childhood Program

This program, sponsored jointly with the Child Development Department, is designed to prepare educators and related service personnel in school psychology, nursing, social work, special education, speech pathology and child development to work with culturally and linguistically different preschool handicapped students with special needs. Upon completion of this program, trainees receive a certificate of competency in multicultural education from the university.

C. English As a Second Language (ESL)

The ESL training program is designed to prepare monolingual credentialed special educators to work with limited English proficient handicapped students. Trainees in this program enroll in four courses that provide them with additional competencies to utilize ESL methodology and culturally appropriate techniques to meet the needs of limited English proficient handicapped students. Upon completion of the program, trainees receive a certificate of competency from the university.

3. Summer Institutes

From time to time, depending on the availability of financial assistance, SERS offers intensive summer institutes in bilingual and multicultural special education to bilingual and monolingual professionals who wish to improve their skills without enrolling in a complete course of studies. In the past, these institutes have emphasized preparing trainees to work with Hispanic and Southeast Asian handicapped students.

## Trainees/Faculty

1. Trainees

Approximately 45-65 bilingual trainees enroll in various courses in the program at any one time. The majority of the trainees take courses on campus, however, approximately 30 trainees typically take the Hispanic learning handicapped program through ITFS. From 1989-1992, 94 trainees participated in the on-campus program. Forty one trainees participated in the ITFS off-campus program.

2. Faculty

Trainees take courses taught in English by the monolingual faculty and courses taught in their TL's or English by the bilingual faculty. Currently, eight of the eleven bilingual special education faculty are teaching courses and supervising trainees in their TL's.

## Development of the Program

The bilingual/multicultural special education program at SJSU was begun in 1979 with a grant from the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) as part of their initiative to encourage colleges and universities to develop programs for Hispanic limited English proficient (LEP)

students with disabilities. Initially, it provided training in the areas of learning handicaps and speech and language disorders.

At that time, none of the faculty involved in the program were trained in bilingual/multicultural special education. (This was the case with most of the faculty of the programs started in 1979, since the field was so new.) The faculty all had experience working with Spanish speaking students with disabilities. They were bilingual in Spanish and English and trained in either bilingual education or special education.

The early years of the program were exciting times, as they are in any pioneering venture. The faculty had to quickly develop expertise in a field that had just started. These early years were spent in identifying the competencies needed by the trainees, designing the program, acquiring the necessary bilingual assessment and curriculum materials, recruiting students, and so on. Communication with the faculty of other IHE programs was essential if the faculty was going to avoid trying to rediscover the wheel. Attending the 1980 and 1981 National Task Oriented Seminars sponsored by OSERS and organized by ACCESS enabled the faculty to learn about what the few real/original pioneers in the field had been doing prior to 1979 and to participate in a small way in the defining of the field. Without the assistance of these pioneers and the financial support of OSERS, the program would probably have died on the vine.

The particular strengths of the faculty and the characteristics of the trainees in the program also influenced the shape the program eventually took (program model). The coordinators of the learning handicaps and speech and language disorders programs were both fluent enough in technical Spanish to teach courses in Spanish. In fact, the coordinator of the learning handicaps program had just returned to the United States from Peru after spending two years as the director of a university-based special education personnel preparation program, with all of the material necessary to teach a complete special education program in Spanish. Most of the trainees in the program had been bilingual teachers prior to entering the program. They were proficient enough in Spanish to take courses in Spanish and there were enough of them to justify teaching a special section of selected courses in Spanish. Thus, the faculty were able to implement one of the major recommendations of the participants at the National Task Oriented Seminars, which was to offer courses in bilingual special education and to do so in the target language of the program trainees.

Faculty support during the initial stages of the program was luke warm at best. Many did not see the need for a bilingual special education program and were against teaching courses in Spanish when the goal was to help students with disabilities learn to function in English. (Their views reflected the anti-bilingual education sentiment prevalent at the time.) Their resistance to the program was reflected in an unwillingness to add any additional courses to the program. Eventually, a compromise was reached; one bilingual special education course was substituted for a regular special education course and the program was permitted to offer a special section of one course taught in Spanish.

The program was fortunate to recruit Dr. Leonard Baca as its external evaluator, a position which he continues to occupy today. The results of his initial evaluation and the evaluations and feedback of the trainees in the program were used to support a request for an expansion in the number of both the bilingual special education courses offered and the courses offered in Spanish. As a result, during the next phase of the program, trainees were offered a total of fifteen units in bilingual special education--twelve of which were taught in Spanish: 9 units were special Spanish language sections of 3 unit courses that were taught to nonbilingual trainees in English and 3 units were offered as additional one-unit courses taken in conjunction with courses taught in English. These Spanish language courses emphasized assessment, first and second language acquisition and language disorders, instruction, and counseling.

Early in the program, the community advisory board decided that it would not be a good idea to add other TL's to the program. There was certainly some reasonable justification for postponing any increase in the number of TL's until the original program was fully established. However, at the time, the Board also appeared reluctant to risk spreading the funds thin by increasing the number of languages. There was also a hint that an attitude of "taking care of one's own" contributed to their decision. After four years, however, they changed their position and recommended that the program expand the number of TL's by two, especially if the program's level of funding could be increased . As a result, two TL's, Portuguese and Pilipino, were added. (After the seventh year of the program, Chinese and Vietnamese emphases were also added.)

The addition of these other TL's was accompanied by some significant changes in both the program model and program contents. The following are a few examples of these differences that necessitated programmatic modifications.

1. Almost all of the trainees in the Chinese, Pilipino, and Vietnamese emphases were native speakers. While many trainees in the Spanish and Portuguese emphases were also native speakers, many were not. Therefore, there was a much greater need to improve the TL fluency of trainees in the Hispanic and Portuguese emphases.

2. Fewer trainees in the Asian Pacific Island emphases than in the Hispanic and Portuguese emphases had already received training in bilingual education when they entered the program. As a result, greater attention had to be paid to improving these trainees' competencies in bilingual and ESL methodologies.

3. Since the vast majority of LEP students with disabilities in California were Spanish speaking, trainees in the other emphases could not expect to work in special education settings in which all of their students spoke their TL's. This required the program to include more multicultural competencies in the trainees' course of study.

The increase in the attention paid to the multicultural aspects of the program also resulted in a shift in the focus of the summer institutes the faculty offered. Until 1986, the purpose of the institutes was to provide in-service training to bilingual Spanish speaking special educators, school psychologists, and speech

and language therapists already employed by local educational agencies (LEA's). Beginning in 1986, the institutes were designed to prepare nonbilingual special education personnel to work with LEP students with disabilities.

Around the same time, a number of factors had led to a dramatic change in the SERS faculty's attitude toward the program. Perhaps most important, there was a huge increase in number of nonEuropean American students taking courses in the Division. In 1978, the year before the initiation of the program, there were only a handful of nonEuropean American students enrolled in the Division. In 1985, the various TL emphases had attracted approximately 50 bilingual nonEuropean American and 10 bilingual European American students to the Division. In a real sense, the number of bilingual/multicultural trainees had reached a critical mass. They represented such a significant proportion of students in regular special education classes that their numbers justified the positions of some faculty members, especially those of some part-time faculty. In addition, their presence in the faculty's classes changed the climate of the classroom.

Trainees in the bilingual/multicultural program claimed that there actually were two programs and two sets of courses in the Division--the one offered by the faculty of the bilingual/multicultural program and the one offered by the monolingual faculty. They complained, for example, that in the introductory assessment course taught by the faculty of the bilingual/multicultural program, they discussed nonbiased assessment, while in the advanced assessment course taught by a monolingual faculty member, nonbiased assessment was never even mentioned. They also complained that many of the instruments that they studied were patently biased. And, students in the regular special education program complained that they were not being exposed to the kind of education the bilingual trainees were receiving even though they too, had many nonEuropean American and LEP students in their classes.

In addition, the proportion of nonEuropean American students in the California schools had increased to over half. On a state-wide basis, and even more so in the university service area, there were more nonEuropean American than European American students in attendance. This led faculty members to be more receptive to the goals of the program.

During the first four or five years of the program, most monolingual members of the faculty had reacted negatively and often defensively whenever the issue of faculty competency in multicultural special education or the lack of multicultural competencies in their courses had been raised. The typical response had been that the students who were in the bilingual special education program needed to be exposed to various points of view; that the students were already getting what they needed; and that the regular special education courses were already so crammed full of competencies that it was impossible to add anything more to them.

In 1985, sensing that the monolingual faculty had changed its attitude toward multicultural special education, the director of the program raised the issue once again. This time, the reception was more positive. Although some professors seemed defensive, most welcomed the prospect of improving their skills.

However, it was clear that they felt they were not knowledgeable enough in the area to do so on their own. They were also concerned about the amount of time that would be required of them. Therefore, a proposal was submitted to OSERS to obtain the funds and released time necessary to provide the help the faculty needed in order to infuse multicultural competencies into their regular special education courses.

Although the goal was to infuse multicultural competencies in all courses, prior to writing the proposal, a decision was made to concentrate the bilingual faculty's efforts on the area of specialization and on the courses that would have the greatest impact on the Division. Six courses were selected for special attention--three generic courses that were taken by all students regardless of their area of specialization and three key courses in the learning handicaps program, the largest program in the Division. The bilingual faculty identified the competencies that should be infused in the three generic courses and all of the courses in the learning handicaps program. (Refer to the section on bilingual/multicultural competencies.) Their conclusions were presented to the faculty for discussion. And with only minor modifications, the faculty enthusiastically committed themselves to carry out the goals of the proposal. *Waiting to raise the issue until the faculty experienced a felt need to modify their courses, assuring them that they would receive the assistance they required, and obtaining the faculty's input and commitment at the outset were probably the most important steps in the infusion process.*

The program received a three year grant that provided 20 percent released time for six faculty members, one each semester. Funds were also available to enable faculty members to make bibliographic searches through ERIC and other data banks, to acquire the materials, articles and so on that they would need, and to attend one national conference of their choice that included presentations, workshops, etc., on bilingual/multicultural special education. In order to get feedback about the project from the students' point of view, some funds were used to recruit monolingual trainees who agreed to enroll in the courses as they were infused with multicultural competencies.

The director of the multicultural infusion project and other faculty members of the bilingual/multicultural emphases assisted the monolingual faculty by providing them with articles and books for them to review, names of individuals who they might consult, suggestions for conferences they might attend, and so on. They also consulted with them about the modules they were preparing. In turn, the monolingual faculty members agreed to infuse their courses with multicultural competencies the following semester, to permit their students to evaluate the multicultural competencies in their courses by means of an instrument designed by the project director, to develop a module that would be used by other faculty members who might teach the course, and to assist them to do so.

The professors of the targeted courses did ask for, and received, assistance. But they preferred to work rather independently and did not seek as much guidance as they originally thought they might need.

Faculty members who taught the courses in the learning handicaps area that were not targeted for this intensive intervention were also helped to infuse their courses with multicultural competencies; however, they did not prepare modules and their courses were not evaluated. Each semester, one of the coordinators of the five emphases programs, Chinese, Pilipino, Portuguese, Spanish, and Vietnamese, provided in-service training opportunities to the total faculty of the Division.

The multicultural competencies in the six target courses were evaluated during three consecutive semesters, regardless of who taught them. In addition, the program's external evaluator, Dr. Baca, performed a detailed evaluation of the project at its conclusion. The objectives of the project were achieved. All six of the targeted courses continued to be infused with multicultural competencies even though they were not always taught by the professors who had prepared the modules. Trainees in the program were very satisfied with the multicultural contents of their courses. The faculty continued to support the original goals of the project, and the climate in the Division became even more supportive of multiculturalism. While it may be coincidental, it is probable that the project contributed to the fact that during this time, a number of monolingual faculty members received grants to initiate multicultural special programs, including a multicultural early childhood special education program and an English as a second language special education program. And, several faculty members began to engage in research in the area of multicultural special education.

The project also produced some disappointments. For example, there was a clear difference in the extent to which the specific objectives of the program were attained in targeted and nontargeted courses and in the targeted and nontargeted areas of specialization. *This suggests two things: (1) faculty may require released time and considerable assistance to accomplish the kind of modifications envisioned here, and (2) the indirect effects of infusing multicultural competencies in one area of specialization on another area may be small .*

Attendance at the in-service training sessions offered to the Division faculty by the coordinators of the language emphases programs, was mixed and not nearly as good as anticipated. The professors of the targeted courses and those faculty members who were interested in and concerned about multicultural issues attended regularly. Unfortunately, some faculty members, especially those who taught in the nontargeted areas of specialization, attended sporadically if at all, despite the fact that meetings were held at the most convenient times possible and ethnic foods were provided for lunch. *This may indicate that some faculty members may have to be actively involved in the infusion process before they change their attitudes and behavior.*

From 1979 to 1987, the program concentrated on serving the needs of school districts within commuting distance of the campus. By 1987, it became apparent that the program was not responding to the acute shortage of bilingual special educators in the distant rural areas of the SJSU service area. Many students who required bilingual special education services attended schools which were too far from the SJSU campus for teachers to attend classes after work and too far from the "more desirable" urban areas such as San Jose and

Santa Cruz to attract and retain graduates of the program. Less than fifteen percent of the graduates of the program worked in these rural areas.

SJSU had been broadcasting courses to some of these rural areas over an interactive television fixed system (ITFS). In the ITFS, students observe the classes while they are being taught live in a TV studio that is set up like a regular university classroom. Students on-campus and off-campus take the courses simultaneously. Off-campus students can call in questions and comments that are heard simultaneously by the professor, students on campus, and students taking the course at the various sites. However, no one in the on-campus TV studio can see anyone off-campus.

A survey of administrators of the LEA's in the area indicated a willingness to refer and encourage their faculty to enroll in a bilingual special education program offered over ITFS. Therefore, a pilot project which broadcast the Hispanic emphasis of the bilingual special education program over the University's interactive TV system was conducted during the 1988-1989 and 1989-1990 academic years. The initial results were extremely encouraging. Fifteen trainees employed by eleven school districts in the target area enrolled in the program. A preliminary evaluation of the results of the training they received was also conducted by comparing the grades they received in the courses they took over ITFS and their evaluations of these courses with those of trainees who took the same courses on campus and by interviewing the trainees themselves. The results indicated that trainees in the pilot program passed their courses with a grade of B or better, and acquired the competencies included in these courses. However, their test scores, course grades, and evaluations of the courses were somewhat lower than trainees who took these courses on campus. (These results were similar to the results reported in the literature of other training programs offered through interactive television.) Interviews with the students indicated that they were very pleased with the program and welcomed the opportunity to receive training they would not be able to avail themselves of on campus. However, they also made the following recommendations for improving the program and making it more like the program offered on campus.

1. Field supervisors should be hired to visit the television sites, both during and after classes in order to provide the kind of personal contact students are afforded when they take courses on campus, to stimulate discussions in Spanish and to supervise their on-the-job practica experiences.

2. Mini resource centers consisting of adequate copies of bilingual assessment and instructional materials, journal articles, books, and so on, should be established at each site since trainees are unable to go to the SJSU campus to obtain these materials and the local libraries do not have specialized collections.

3. Financial assistance should be provided so that more trainees will be encouraged and assisted to enroll in the program.

Clearly, it was necessary to obtain outside funding to follow the trainees' recommendations. When this idea was first broached, the faculty of SERS and

the administrators of the ITFS program were ambivalent about seeking federal support. At the time, it appeared that their resistance was due to two factors: (1) their agreement that the bilingual/multicultural special education program needed to be improved implied that the other courses offered by SERS and other departments also needed improvement, and (2) the demand for additional services that ITFS was not providing at the time. In the end, they did support the idea.

Attempts to improve the program also created problems for the community colleges to which the program was broadcasted. Broadcasting courses to a site merely required a room set up for viewing a TV monitor. The program improvements and the expansion of the number of students at each site envisioned by the project required office space for the site supervisors, space for meetings after class, secure space for the mini resource centers, access to copy machines, additional pressure on the limited parking spaces available, and so on.

A proposal was submitted to the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. The proposal was funded; the program was continued in an expanded form; and the trainees' recommendations were implemented.

The problems with the SERS faculty, ITFS administration and community colleges took time and effort to resolve. ITFS became extremely supportive almost immediately after the federal grant was received. In fact, it is unclear whether the problems at the off-campus sites would ever have been solved without ITFS's support and intervention with the community colleges.

At first the SERS faculty did not support the program. Their attitude changed when students who were taking courses over ITFS in the regular special education program began to make comparisons between the quality of their program and the additional services offered to students in the bilingual/multicultural special education program and to pressure for the same kinds of improvements in their program. Again, it was the trainees who helped the faculty perceive the need to change. Now, the faculty accepts the implications of the fact that students in the regular special education program who take courses over ITFS received lower grades and evaluate their professors and their courses lower than students who simultaneously take the exact same courses on campus. And they are wrestling with the need to improve the regular ITFS special education program.

The following is a description of the evolution of the ITFS program from the point of view of a site supervisor, Irene Nares-Guzicki.

> "The off-campus bilingual special education ITFS program is a very innovative and comprehensive service for the surrounding communities of San Jose State University. It fulfills the needs of school districts in hiring competent bilingual special education teachers, and simultaneously it fulfills the convenience and financial needs of bilingual teachers pursuing their special education credential goal. As a site supervisor of two of these off-campus communities/ sites south of SJSU, I discovered the role

and responsibilities to be very rewarding and challenging. As time progressed, I found my role being refined and the responsibilities changing in importance depending on the period of the three year grant. This review will attempt to convey the role and responsibilities of a site supervisor and the various problems and solutions encountered as the grant unfolded.

Before beginning, however, some background information is necessary. The off-campus sites I oversee are sprawled throughout various counties: One site is situated in a small room or classroom at Cabrillo College in Santa Cruz County. The other site is located at SJSU extended campus: Monterey County Campus (MCC). Each site is a considerable distance from the main SJSU campus. Also worth mentioning are the valuable unofficial, additional skills that I discovered to be essential in enhancing my effectiveness and credibility as a site supervisor. These were: a) my experiences having taught one semester on ITFS. Just the experience in itself helps in gaining a better understanding when working with the on-campus instructor of the bilingual special education classes, and b) my in-depth understanding not only of the on-campus bilingual special education program, but the routine Division procedures and university advisement information as well.

The first year of the grant involved defining my role and discovering the various responsibilities that were involved. Since the bilingual special education classes met from 4-7 p.m. on Wednesdays, I alternated my services every other Wednesday for the two sites. Upon meeting the students enrolled in our bilingual special education program at the sites, I enthusiastically introduced myself and my role. I was to be their liaison between the on-campus program/university and them. I was also their liaison with the on-campus ITFS instructor, facilitating discussions, team teaching, and answering questions during the last half of each class session. Finally, I was going to be their advisor throughout the length of their involvement with the program. This advisement could occur any day by phone from work or home; through a prior meeting arrangement; or during advisement hour 7-8 p.m following every Wednesday class. In addition, I would be meeting with them as an instructor for three one unit classes taught in Spanish throughout the program.

My responsibilities were numerous throughout the first year, however, three of the highest priority and on-going responsibilities were in:

1) building good public relations at the sites;
2) endless advisement and guidance for the students at the sites, who often expressed their gratitude that finally there was this convenient "live link" in the chain of off and on campus programs; and
3) continuous open communication concerning the teaching

style, goals, and needs of the on-campus instructor, and the concerns/needs of the students at the off-campus sites, which was accomplished mainly through an on-going log kept by the project manager and shared with the on-campus instructor.

Having lived and worked in the communities south of San Jose was truly an advantage in building good public relations, not only with the students at the two sites, but with the staff as well. Within time, individual roles and good working relationships were established with the ITFS site assistants; the ITFS on-campus coordinator; the continuing education director at Cabrillo College; the director and assistant director at MCC; the secretaries and custodians at both sites; and the directors of library services at both sites. Yet, I quickly learned that each site had their own "personality", coupled with their individualized problems and needs. There were numerous initial problems at the sites. Some of these included, but were not limited to:

1) Parking problems and crowded classroom conditions (mainly at the Cabrillo site);
2) Limited resources despite site fee payment (only at Cabrillo);
3) Slow delivery and limited availability of textbooks and course readers needed for the class (at both sites);
4) Limited library use (at both sites);
5) Need for faculty mailbox and access to duplicating services (at both sites);
6) Limited and/or lack of office space and room for advisement (at both sites);
7) Lack of classroom for one unit seminar meetings (at both sites); and
8) Lack of space for mini resource centers (at both sites).

Other less serious concerns involved advisement issues and the frequency of communication between the on-campus instructors and I. Following numerous telephone calls, memos, and meetings with the project director, other directors, and the Dean, many solutions were finalized. These included, but were not limited to:

1) Faculty parking permit/area issued at the beginning of each semester (Parking was included for the students in the site fee payment services at Cabrillo);
2) Faculty mailbox was issued at MCC and a faculty communication envelope was initiated at Cabrillo;
3) Duplicating access was permitted at MCC and limited duplication services were available at Cabrillo;

4) Extensive library use at MCC was issued and limited services at Cabrillo;

5) An office with a phone was provided at MCC site and various classrooms provided for advisement at Cabrillo site;

6) ITFS classroom and/or conference room provided for seminar meetings at MCC site and classroom assignments varied for most of the seminars at Cabrillo site;

7) Space and bookshelves were provided at the MCC library for our mini resource center at the MCC site and a space for a filing cabinet was provided at the Cabrillo site.

Half way through the first year, I was given full responsibility for accepting students into the program and for their advisement thereafter. However, students were slow to accept the fact that I was really the person "in charge." In fact, it wasn't until the project director made this clear to the students, that they accepted my role.

Communication between the on-campus instructor and site supervisor was established at least once per week, within one to two days following the Wednesday class meeting to share information, suggestions and ideas, and/or concerns.

During the second year of the grant, my role remained the same. I continued to encounter numerous challenges, including three major ones:

1) Keeping the first year accomplishments polished and thriving by making minor programmatic improvements;

2) Planning and implementing an active recruitment process to enable more students to enroll in the ITFS bilingual special education program; and

3) Organizing and establishing the assessment instruments and other materials for the mini resource center at each site.

From the outset of the program , brochures and handouts about the ITFS bilingual special education program were disseminated upon request to individual potential candidates. Brochures were posted throughout the junior college communities , school districts, and offices. Program announcements were given in classes and follow-up phone calls and advisement meetings were held. And yet, there appeared to be too many gaps in the recruitment process, and we were not contacting enough potential candidates. One of the solutions was to take an active role in the recruitment process. One method of accomplishing this goal was to directly or indirectly contact bilingual teachers in all of the

various school districts for each of the counties involved within the ITFS sites south of SJSU. This involved making a list of all the school districts within the participating counties; telephone numbers and names of directors of bilingual projects and special education programs. I then contacted each one directly or through the secretary, and either a) met with director and bilingual teachers at one of their monthly meetings, or b) delivered flyers regarding our program directly to the bilingual teachers/staff at each of the schools. Due to the large amount of responses, I devised color coded forms to be completed by the project manager for each student as the steps in the recruitment process were implemented and the student finally enrolled.

Ordering and obtaining assessment and curriculum materials has been an on-going process since the onset of the ITFS grant program. At first these materials were kept in the trunk of my car for easy access when needed for classes or for check-out purposes by the students. After several meetings at the MCC site, a large space with plenty of bookshelves at the MCC library was allocated for the use for our program's materials. A circulation procedure was established and the assessments and materials were organized and placed on the shelves for unlimited use. Despite several conversations with the administration at the Cabrillo site, the Cabrillo library remained off limits for our mini resource center due to lack of space. So I purchased a large filing cabinet with a lock; placed all the materials and assessments in an organized manner in the drawers; and set the full filing cabinet in our ITFS room at Cabrillo where the classes are broadcasted. Circulation procedures were established with the site assistants involved with the bilingual special education classes.

Presently, in the third year of the grant, I foresee my role to be more defined. I envision my responsibilities to be the goals I created based on the needs and concerns of myself and the students. These include:

1) Maintaining the same responsibilities implemented the first two years of the grant and enhancing them;

2) Improve the communication with our students and our graduates from the bilingual special education program by circulating a quarterly newsletter with advisement information among other interesting news. Communication will also be enhanced with our program's graduates by having their bilingual special education classes visited by our program's current students. In this way, our students can learn from their peer graduates about the realities out in the field of bilingual special education employment.

3) Continue to increase the publicity of our bilingual special education ITFS grant.

I foresee little, if any, problems, with these goals.

In conclusion, the ITFS grant in bilingual special education was indeed a dream come true for the many students living miles away from the closest university, SJSU. Here was the perfect opportunity to earn the learning handicapped credential with a bilingual/crosscultural Hispanic emphasis, in the convenience of their residential area, and still not isolated from the main campus. My role became more defined as time progressed; my duties and responsibilities varied in degree of importance.

Most of the goals since the onset of this ITFS grant in bilingual special education have been accomplished. Highlights are summarized below:

First Year

a) Orientation of the sites and building good public relations;

b) Providing advisement and guidance for students feeling forgotten from the main campus; and

c) Building open communication with the on-campus instructor and the off-campus students.

Second Year

a) Keeping the first year accomplishments thriving;

b) Planning and implementing an active recruitment process to enable more students to enroll in the ITFS bilingual special education program; and

c) Organizing and establishing a mini resource center at each site.

Third Year

a) Maintain the accomplishments and responsibilities of the first two years;

b) Improve the communication with our students and graduates through newsletters and visits to graduates' schools/ classrooms of employment; and

c) Continue to increase publicity about the ITFS bilingual special education grant.

In 1992, Dr. Leonard Baca, the program's external evaluator made a comprehensive evaluation of the program. The following were his main conclusions.

"The Bilingual special education televised graduate program at San Jose State University has been very successful and has accomplished all of it's objectives. It is a strong, well developed and effectively administered program. It enjoys strong student, faculty, and administrative support. Local school districts and community agencies consider it to be a very important part of the

University's offerings. It is very highly regarded as a model program by colleagues throughout the country. The three year grant which has been the focus of this evaluation has contributed significantly to the quality of the program in bilingual special education as well as to the quality of the special education offerings of the division in general. The project director, faculty and the staff are to be commended for making a significant contribution to bilingual special education both at the national as well as at the state level in California."

Dr. Baca's conclusions led the faculty to plan for an additional expansion of the program. A proposal was recently submitted to obtain the funds necessary to initiate a Chinese emphasis program to serve the needs of the Chinese American community in outlying areas, to add a fifth site to the Hispanic emphasis, and to offer a multicultural special education program to improve the skills of the monolingual special educators who work in the school districts served by the ITFS system.

## Institutionalization of the Program

The institutionalization of the program has been a high priority. Its institutionalization was achieved through a series of steps.

Throughout the thirteen year period an effort has been made to recruit bilingual/nonEuropean American faculty and to place them in tenure track positions. Initially bilingual special educators were recruited for bilingual positions. In recent years, preference has been given to applicants with bilingual/multicultural. competencies.

The University gradually assumed the additional costs associated with the program. After the first full three year funding cycle in 1983, the program director emphasized to the Dean of the College of Education and the Chair of SERS that in order to continue to obtain funding from the the U. S. Department of Education it would be necessary to demonstrate progress toward the institutionalization of the program. As a result, the University agreed to pay the cost of offering courses in the various target languages of the program. After the next cycle of funding, in 1986 to demonstrate further progress toward the institutionalization of the program the University agreed to provide the director of the bilingual/multicultural special education program 20 percent released time to administer the program. In 1989 the University agreed to pay all the costs of broadcasting the bilingual crosscultural program over the ITFS system. Thus, since 1986 the major expenses of the program, excluding financial assistance to students has been assumed and guaranteed by the University.

The University's commitment to the program was recently tested. During the current year, the California State University system, including SJSU, experienced severe budget reductions. Most part-time faculty were let go and

the number of courses offered was reduced. This happened coincidentally with the termination of the grant that supported the on-campus program. Two reasons were put forth to the administration to support the contention that the program should be excluded from the reductions. (1) The University had made commitments to the program and the U. S. Department of Education. (2) The program is the major service provided to nonEuropean students with disabilities who comprise approximately 50 percent of the students in special education on a state-wide basis. The Dean of the College of Education, the Chair of SERS and the head of the Learning Handicaps Program agreed. And, despite the budget, faculty, and course reductions, the on-campus program is continuing without any reduction in University support. All of the courses taught in the target languages of the project continue to be offered. The target language coordinators continue to fulfill their roles, and the University is providing twenty percent released time for the coordination of the program.

It must be noted however, that although the lack of financial assistance for trainees did not lead many students already in the program to discontinue their studies, it has resulted in a significant decline in the number of new trainees enrolling in the program. For this and other reasons a proposal to obtain funding for the on-campus program will be submitted this year.

# Description of the Program

## Program Model

Leaders in the field of bilingual special education have identified a number of models for delivering services to LEP students with disabilities (10, 11). Ortiz, Yates & Garcia (1990) have defined three. The integrated bilinguai special education model is used when a single bilingual special educator provides bilingual special education services. In the coordinated service model, LEP students are served by a team consisting of a bilingual educator and a special educator neither of whom can provide bilingual special education services alone. In the bilingual support model, bilingual paraprofessionals are teamed with monolingual special educators. Baca and Cervantes (1989) have categorized the models in a somewhat different manner: the integrated bilingual special education model, the infusion model, the minority recruitment model, and the parallel model.

San Jose State University has both the bilingual faculty and students required to utilize the most preferred model--integrated bilingual special education--as its training model (10, 11). As Dr. Baca stated in his recent evaluation of the ITFS program at SJSU,

> "The San Jose State bilingual special education program utilizes the most sophisticated and effective bilingual special education training model available in the U.S. today. This model

is referred to by Baca and Cervantes as a 'true' and integrated bilingual special education model. In this type of program the needs of LEP handicapped students and the corresponding teacher competencies are identified and then become the basis for the development of a unique set of new courses and experiences for the trainees."

## Program Contents

The program contents reflect the unique status of the trainees. Trainees in the project fit into one of the following four categories when they begin the program:

1) There is such a severe shortage of special educators in California that most trainees in the various special education personnel preparation programs in the state are part of an internship program. As interns they teach special education in local school districts under emergency credentials and are given released days in order to complete the courses required to receive their credentials. They take an average of six units per semester in a credential program. About a third of the bilingual/crosscultural trainees in the project have been and will probably continue to be interns in special education.

2) Almost half of the trainees are bilingual educators employed in their local school districts' bilingual education programs at the outset of their training. They have either been encouraged by their districts to continue their education in order to assist the district to serve the needs of LEP students with disabilities or have decided to return to school for their own reasons to obtain a special education credential. All of these bilingual educators are rapidly transferred by their districts to the districts' special education programs prior to completing the program.

3) Most of the remaining trainees are recent graduates of the SJSU bilingual education program who have decided to become special educators. As noted above, the shortage of bilingual/crosscultural special educators is so severe that despite the considerable number of graduates of the program who teach in the service area, there is still so few bilingual/crosscultural special educators in the counties served by SJSU that virtually all of these unemployed trainees avail themselves of the opportunity to obtain employment as bilingual/crosscultural special educators prior to completing the program.

4) Less than 10 percent of the trainees are unemployed teachers who have decided to return to school to become special educators. Most of the trainees in this group have raised a family and have elected to return to school. Others are ex-Peace Corps volunteers or individuals who have decided to change careers. Like the other trainees in the program, almost all of the trainees in this group obtain employment prior to completing the program.

Since the initiation of the program, only two trainees were not employed as bilingual special educators prior to completing the program.

The program contents reflect these facts. For example, there is no traditional student teaching experience. Instead practica experiences are built into most courses and trainees are observed and supervised on the job. Trainees who are employed enroll in a supervision course during the very first semester in the program. As part of this course they are observed and supervised on a regular basis by the bilingual faculty. All trainees also enroll in a practicum course during their final semester. Again they are observed and supervised on a regular basis by the bilingual faculty.

While the program model has remained fairly consistent, the contents of the program has undergone numerous revisions. The following is a description of the current contents of the program.

Trainees enrolled in any of the bilingual/crosscultural emphases programs fulfill all of the requirements for the regular special education credential as well as the certificate of competency as bilingual special educators. The program in the area of the learning (mildly) handicapped is described in detail here. The programs in the areas of the communicatively handicapped and severely handicapped are similar but differ in some important respects.

The courses of study in the area of the learning handicapped consists of 44 graduate credits.

- ~ 6 introductory units in special education and learning handicapped students (EDINT192, EDSE 107)
- ~ 4 units on nonbiased assessment (EDSE 215, EDSE 298*)
- ~ 7 units in language acquisition and development and ESL and bilingual methodologies (EDSE 102, EDSE 290B, EDSE 298*)
- ~ 4 units on culture (EDSE 224, EDSE 298*)
- ~ 7 units on behavior management and counseling (EDSE 179, EDSE 228, EDSE 298*)
- ~ 10 units on instruction (EDSE 216*, EDSE 222, EDSE 230*, EDSE 298*)
- ~ 6 practicum units with limited English proficient learning handicapped students (EDSE 217 A & B*)

* Course taught in Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, or Vietnamese

## Courses

| | |
|---|---|
| EDINT 192 | Mainstreaming |
| EDSE 102 | Speech and Language for Normal and Exceptional Individuals |
| EDSE 107 | Introduction to the Learning Handicapped |
| EDSE 179 | Managing Behavioral and Emotional Problems of Exceptional Individuals |
| EDSE 215 | Advanced Assessment for the Learning Handicapped |
| * EDSE 216 | Language Arts Programs for the Learning Handicapped |
| * EDSE 217 | Student Teaching-Learning Handicapped |
| EDSE 222 | Career and Academic Development for Exceptional Individuals |
| EDSE 224 | The Bilingual Bicultural Student in Special Education |
| EDSE 228 | Counseling and Consultation Skills for Special Educators |
| * EDSE 230 | Math, Science and Social Studies for the Learning Handicapped |
| EDSE 290B | ESL Methods and Materials for Learning Disabled Students |
| * EDSE 298A | Practicum in Assessing LEP Learning Handicapped Students |
| * EDSE 298B | Curriculum Adaptations for LEP Learning Handicapped Students |
| * EDSE 298C | Seminar in Cultural Adaptations |
| * EDSE 298D | Practicum in Bilingual Language Assessment |
| * EDSE 298E | Counseling LEP Learning Handicapped Students |

* Course taught in Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, or Vietnamese

## Bilingual/Multicultural Competencies

In addition to the competencies required for the regular special education credential, trainees also demonstrate additional competencies for working with Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, or Vietnamese speaking LEP students with learning handicaps. The specific competencies required for the certificate of competency in bilingual/cross-cultural special education are described below.

The selection of these competencies was originally based on the following:

- deliberations of project directors and faculty members of IHE's bilingual special education personnel preparation programs during the 1980 and 1981 National Task Oriented Seminars sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education.

- deliberations of the program advisory board which was composed of representatives from LEA's and the SEA as well as the faculty of various departments of SJSU.

- the then current published expert opinion and research.

Since then, the program has been refined regularly on the basis of recommendations from LEA and SEA staff and program graduates, the results of internal and external evaluations, and new developments and insights derived from the practical experience and research of others. While the program faculty reads all of the relevant research, they have been especially influenced by the publications of the following experts in the area of preparing personnel to serve culturally and linguistically different students with disabilities: Leonard Baca, Patricia Cegelka, Philip Chinn, Nancy Cloud, James Cummins, Richard Figueroa, Sandra Fradd, Herbert Grossman, Wayne Holtzman, Patricia Landurand, Alba Ortiz, Maximo Plata, Alphonso Preito, Robert Rueda, and James Yates.

The program contents are designed to impart the same competencies to all trainees in the Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, and Vietnamese language emphases, but the different competencies receive varying degrees of stress in each emphasis. Three examples of these program adaptations follow.

1. Almost all of the trainees in the Chinese, Pilipino, and Vietnamese emphases are native speakers. While many trainees in the Spanish emphasis are also native speakers, many are not. All emphases programs include courses taught in the target languages as well as in English. However, because there is a much greater need to improve the non-English language skills of trainees in the Hispanic emphasis, they take more of their course work in their target language.

2. Many more trainees in the Hispanic emphasis than in the Chinese, Pilipino, and Vietnamese emphases have already received training in bilingual education when they enter the program. As a result, fewer trainees in the Hispanic emphasis are required to enroll in EDSE 290B, the course that deals with bilingual and ESL methodologies.

3. The vast majority of LEP students with disabilities in California are Spanish speaking. Trainees in the Hispanic program can realistically expect to work in special education settings in which all of their students will be LEP Spanish speakers. This is not the case for trainees in the Chinese, Pilipino, and Vietnamese emphases . In addition, there are more assessment and instructional materials available in Spanish than Chinese, Pilipino, and Vietnamese Therefore, less emphasis is placed in the Hispanic program on such competencies as working with interpreters and developing and adapting assessment and instructional materials in students' native languages.

The description below, therefore, is a generic description of all emphases programs. In actual practices, there are differences between the programs like those described and explained above. The following are the additional bilingual/multicultural competencies included in the program and the activities followed to enable the trainees to attain these competencies. The bilingual faculty routinely include these competencies and activities in the courses they teach. The regular special education faculty usually do so since the competencies were infused into their courses as part of the multicultural grant. However, the extent to which they follow the "game plan" varies from person to person.

## Language Fluency

1. The trainees are able to communicate effectively in Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, or Vietnamese with LEP students and their parents. (Admission to this program is open only to students who are proficient enough to attend classes taught in Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, or Vietnamese as determined by the state administered proficiency examination and/or an interview with the site supervisors. All students must become completely fluent in their TL prior to completion of the program.)

2. Trainees are able to communicate effectively in English with LEP students and their parents.

Activities

1. Trainees attend bilingual cross-cultural core courses which are taught completely in Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, or Vietnamese.

2. All communication between faculty and trainees in offices, during meetings, etc., is in Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, or Vietnamese.

3. In their practica experiences trainees work with LEP students and their parents.

## Culture

1. The trainee is knowledgeable of general cultural characteristics of nonEuropean American families including lifestyles, family structures, and community support systems.

2. The trainee understands the relevance of nonEuropean American child rearing practice in the students' cognitive, emotional, and social development.

3. The trainee is aware of cultural conflicts resulting from ethnic differences that may affect the students' self-image and thus influence their emotional and social development.

4. The trainee institutes a teaching process that takes into account the impact of cultural conflicts on the students' performance.

5. The trainee assesses and interprets observed classroom behavior in terms of different nonEuropean American cultural norms.

6. The trainee demonstrates a knowledge of the ethnic, religious and socioeconomic factors which are part of parents' dynamics, affect parental access to community resources and influence the counseling process.

7. The trainee understands the acculturation process of culturally diverse individuals into the mainstream of American society.

8. The trainee implements techniques to facilitate the integration of LEP students into American Schools.

9. The trainee is knowledgeable of different types of handicapping conditions and their interaction with sociocultural and linguistic variables.

Activities

1. Through reading, guest lectures and class discussions in EDSE 179, EDSE 230, EDSE 216, EDSE 224, EDSE 228, EDSE 298C, the trainees will acquire an awareness of different nonEuropean American cultural characteristics.

2. Readings about cultural influences on cognitive styles are included in EDSE 224. Trainees evaluate exceptional students' cognitive styles in EDSE 215 and EDSE 298A. They utilize this information in teaching LEP students in EDSE 217 A&B.

3. Through a case study approach in EDSE 224, EDSE 228, and EDSE 298C, trainees become aware of the difficulties experienced by immigrants during the acculturation process.

4. Through reading, class discussions and case studies in EDSE 228, trainees become aware of the relevancy of different nonEuropean American cultures for the counseling process.

5. Through lecture and readings and case studies in EDSE 179 trainees will be able to observe and interpret the behavior of nonEuropean American students in terms of cultural norms and select culturally appropriate classroom management techniques.

6. Through reading, guest lectures and case studies in EDSE 230, EDSE 216 and EDSE 298B trainees are able to select culturally appropriate instructional strategies for nonEuropean American learning handicapped students.

## Non-Discriminatory Assessment

1. Trainee demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the legal basis of bilingual bicultural education and special education in the U.S. Trainee demonstrates critical understanding of relevant laws and regulations which impact on the assessment and placement of LEP students.

2. The trainee is aware of the uses and limitations of current standard assessment techniques in regard to LEP students.

3. The trainee utilizes procedures and instruments in English, Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, and Vietnamese and interprets the results using pluralistic multicultural norms when available. These instruments and procedures include commercially available tests, criterion reference tests, teacher prepared tests, diagnostic teaching, and standardized tests with multicultural and pluralistic norms as well as informal observations.

4. The trainee is aware of the influence of cognitive styles, cultural values, and language patterns of ethnic and minority groups on test performance.

5. The trainee formulates an accurate description of student ability based upon observation of academic performance in light of the students' cultural background.

Activities

1. Trainees become knowledgeable about the legal basis of bilingual bicultural education and special education through readings, lectures and class discussions in EDSE 224 and through application of rules and regulations to specific cases.

2. Trainees become aware of the relevant research concerning the use of specific assessment procedures with LEP students through readings, lectures and class discussions in EDSE 107 and EDSE 298A. Trainee evaluates

English, Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, and Vietnamese assessment procedures utilizing appropriate guidelines.

3. Trainees utilize informal and formal procedures in English, Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, and Vietnamese to assess LEP students in EDSE 298A, EDSE 215, and EDSE 217 under supervision.

## Language Assessment

1. The trainee understands the process of first and second language acquisition.

2. The trainee describes typical differences observed in the oral and written English language of speakers of Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish or Vietnamese in comparison to that of speakers of standard English.

3. The trainee distinguishes between the above differences in oral and written language and errors which may indicate deviant or deficient speech and makes appropriate referrals.

4. The trainee selects non-discriminatory assessment procedures in English and in Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, or Vietnamese to evaluate oral and written language development and proficiency.

5. The trainee uses the information gained to help to determine the LEP students' most appropriate and least restrictive educational setting.

6. The trainee is aware of how non-verbal behaviors of LEP students may lead to miscommunication between students and teachers.

Activities

1. Trainees study the process of first and second language acquisition in reading, lectures and class discussion in EDSE 102.

2. In readings, lectures and class discussions in EDSE 102 and EDSE 298D trainees become knowledgeable about typical errors observed in the English and nonEnglish language acquisition.

3. Trainees administer, score, and interpret English and Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, or Vietnamese language assessment instruments in EDSE 102 and EDSE 298D.

4. Trainees utilize these instruments in EDSE 217B to evaluate the development of students' oral and written language.

5. Trainees review research and critiques of English and Chinese, Pilipino, Spanish, or Vietnamese language assessment procedures in EDSE 102 and EDSE 298D.

## Instructional Strategies

1. The trainee utilizes bilingual/bicultural materials and strategies to improve the bilingual development of LEP students.

2. The trainee applies instructional strategies in light of cultural, socioeconomic, and language factors influencing learning.

3. The trainee plans, designs, and implements special education programs for LEP students in accordance with legislative requirements and guidelines.

4. The trainee utilizes ESL methods to foster the English language proficiency of LEP students.

Activities

1. Trainees study ESL methods in EDSE 290B.

2. Through lectures, readings and class discussions in all courses in the bilingual cross-cultural core, trainees become aware of the nonEnglish language materials which could be used with LEP students

3. Trainees adapt English language materials for LEP students in EDSE 230, EDSE 216, EDSE 217 A&B and EDSE 298B.

4. Trainees study culturally and linguistically appropriate instructional strategies in EDSE 216 and EDSE 230.

5. Trainees apply their knowledge of cultural and linguistic factors when selecting intervention and instructional strategies in their two practice experiences EDSE 217 A & B.

## Counseling, Consultation, Advocacy and Referral

1. Trainee provides non-biased counseling to parents of LEP students.

   a) The trainee adapts the counseling process to the ethnic, religious and socioeconomic realities of the parents.

   b) The trainee explains the implications of bilingual and special education legislation and regulations to the parents.

   c) The trainee assesses those factors limiting the participation of nonEuropean American parents in the educational decision making process and develops strategies for overcoming them.

   d) The trainee assists parents in understanding their children's learning problems, strengths and weaknesses.

e) The trainee provides parents with information about available community resources and facilitates referrals.

f) The trainee assists the parents to collaborate at home with the instructional and management techniques utilized in the school.

g) The trainee assists families to understand and deal with attitudes, life-styles, behaviors and educational methods of American society and its schools.

2. The trainee consults with non-bilingual professionals who impact with students in order to interpret students' behavior, explain significance of test results, assist in the selection of appropriate non-biased remedial and intervention procedures, advise about placements when necessary and explain the implication of bilingual and special education legislation and regulations.

Activities

1. In readings, lectures, and class discussion in EDSE 228 and EDSE 298E, trainees become knowledgeable about the community resources available to LEP students, factors which impede the participation of parents in the educational decision making process, and the specific ways in which different nonEuropean American cultural factors affect the counseling process.

2. Trainees visit and volunteer in agencies that provide services to LEP students and their parents in EDSE 298E.

3. In EDSE 228 trainees select appropriate referrals for the LEP students and their parents presented in case studies.

4. Parents of LEP students discuss their experiences in EDSE 298E and EDSE 228.

5. Techniques for advocating rights of LEP students and their parents are presented in EDSE 228.

6. Trainees practice counseling, consulting and advocacy techniques in role playing exercises in EDSE 228 and EDSE 298E.

## Classroom Management

1. The trainee is aware of cultural influences on behavior.

2. The trainee appreciates the problems immigrant and refugee students experience while having to adjust to schools in which they are taught in an unfamiliar teaching style in a language they do not understand.

3. The trainee evaluates classroom behavior of LEP students in terms of cultural norms.

4. The trainee adapts techniques for helping students with emotional and behavioral problems to students' cultural characteristics.

Activities

1. In EDSE 179 trainees become knowledgeable about the effects of culture on behavior and the adjustment problems of immigrant and refugee students.

2. Trainees apply their knowledge of different nonEuropean American cultural characteristics when evaluating the behavior of students presented in case studies and selecting appropriate intervention strategies and techniques in EDSE 179.

## Concluding Comments

The bilingual/multicultural special education program at San Jose State University has been evolving over the years. New programs have been added and some have been discontinued. The Portuguese emphases and the Spanish severely handicapped program ran out of trainees two years ago because of the small pool of potential candidates they recruit from. New programs such as a multicultural resource specialist are anticipated. The program has grown to the point that the on-campus and off-campus programs have separate directors.

Change brings progress, maintains faculty interest, and helps avoid burn-out. In thirteen years, it may be necessary to disseminate another report if the program continues to evolve.

# APPENDIX

# A LONGITUDINAL EVALUATION REPORT

# FOR THE

# BILINGUAL SPECIAL EDUCATION

# GRADUATE TRAINING PROGRAM

# 1979 - 1993

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY

DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

HERBERT GROSSMAN Ph.D.

PROGRAM DIRECTOR

LEONARD BACA

EXTERNAL EVALUATOR

BUENO CENTER FOR MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction ..... 1

Historical Evolution of Program ..... 2

Chronology of Grants and Program Development ..... 7

Mean Score Rating for Competency Attainment ..... 13

Summary ..... 15

Recommendations ..... 16

# SAN JOSE STATE BILINGUAL SPECIAL EDUCATION

# A LONGITUDINAL EVALUATION

# 1979 - 1993

## INTRODUCTION

This report is a comprehensive review of the program development and implementation efforts in the area of Bilingual Special Education at San Jose State University between 1979 and 1993. This external evaluator evaluated four of the specific programs during this time period. These individual evaluation efforts included four on site visits that incorporated faculty, staff, administrator, and student interviews as well as classroom observations. The information presented in summary form in this report is taken from these individual site visits and reports. In addition an attempt has been made to integrate the information and data into a historical and longitudinal report.

The San Jose State Bilingual Special Education program as it is currently constituted utilizes the most sophisticated and effective bilingual special education training model available in the US. today. This model is referred to by Baca and Cervantes (1989) as a "true" and integrated bilingual special education model. In this type of program the needs of LEP handicapped students and the corresponding teacher competencies are identified and then become the basis for the development of a unique set of new courses and experiences for the trainees. This model is superior to the infusion model and the minority recruitment model as well as to the parallel model which juxtaposes a series of bilingual courses along side a series of special education courses. The program is made up of eight to fifteen core courses that are taught in English and five to eight courses

that are taught in the native or target languages. Completion of the program requirements leads to a masters degree and a certificate of competency in bilingual special education in the State of California. A complete program description is included in the appendix of this report.

## HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF PROGRAM

In the summer of 1979 Professor Herbert Grossman returned to the US. from a teaching assignment in Latin America. He accepted a position in the fall of 1979 with the College of Education at San Jose State University. The Division of the Special Education and Rehabilitative Services had already recognized the need for improving special education teacher training for the rapidly increasing number of linguistically and culturally different students with disabilities in the California public schools. One year before Dr. Grossman arrived, Dr. Guerin, chair of the Division and Professor Alba Ortiz had begun to develop a program that would prepare teachers to meet the needs of these culturally and linguistically different students with disabilities. Drs. Ortiz and Guerin wrote an initial federal proposal to the US. Department of Education to help support this effort. At this point Dr. Ortiz left San Jose State. The project was funded and Dr. Herbert Grossman was hired to head up this important area of development in bilingual special education teacher training.

This first training project which was funded by the Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, (OSERS), was a one year grant from 1979 to 1980. The project was designed to train teachers for the Learning Handicapped (LH) and for specialists in Communications Disorders (CD). This initial effort was the beginning of

what is now known as the Bilingual Special Education Program, the largest and most comprehensive of its kind in the United States.

In 1980 the Division received a second grant to continue the bilingual special education training in the areas of LH and CD. This project was funded for three years through 1983. During this time period OSERS also funded two national level technical assistance projects related to bilingual special education. The first was project ACCESS which was located in Washington, DC. and directed by Dr. Maria Pinn and the second was the BUENO Multicultural Special Education Project (MUSEP) directed by Dr. Leonard Baca at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Dr. Grossman was actively involved in both of these technical assistance projects which were designed to bring Bilingual Special Educators together to support one another and to develop the knowledge base and expertise needed to implement successful programs at the University level.

Dr. Pinn's ACCESS project convened the leaders in the emerging field of bilingual special education and developed the first comprehensive report on teacher competencies in the area of bilingual special education. This document was a landmark in the evolution of the field and Dr. Grossman contributed heavily to this effort.

Dr. Baca's BUENO MUSEP's work also convened the leaders in the field to establish a national research agenda and state of the art best practices in bilingual special education. Dr. Grossman was an invited keynote speaker and participant in these important meetings which also helped shaped the development of bilingual special education at the national level. The research agenda developed in this project was then used by Dr. Ed Sontag

of OSERS as the basis for funding two national minority handicapped research institutes (MHRI) in Los Angeles California and Austin Texas. The Institute in Los Angeles was at the Southwest Laboratory for Educational Research. This project was headed up by Dr. Robert Rueda. The other MHRI was established at the University of Texas at Austin and headed by Dr. Alba Ortiz.

During this same period (1981) the Council for Exceptional Children sponsored the first national bilingual special education symposium in New Orleans, Louisiana. Dr. Grossman was invited to speak at this conference and share his successful training model with colleagues from throughout the country.

In 1983 the San Jose State University bilingual special education program reached another important landmark in its development. Dr. Grossman was funded by the Department of Education to expand the program to include not only the LH and the CD populations but the severely handicapped (SH) as well. In addition this grant also supported the addition of two new language groups. These were Filipino and Portuguese This of course required that additional faculty members who could teach core courses in these languages be recruited and hired as part time faculty and program coordinators.

During this early period of development steps were taken by professor Grossman and his colleagues to begin institutionalizing various aspects of the program. For example the new specialized courses were approved by the university and included in the catalog as regular ongoing course offerings. The Division of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

committed itself to continue offering the program after federal funds were no longer available. The ongoing grant activity, however, enabled professor Grossman and his colleagues to add new and extra components to the program. The grants also provided student tuition and stipend support for students who could not have attended the University without support.

In 1985 Dr. Grossman was able to acquire federal support for the addition of Chinese and Vietnamese program concentrations. The program was thus expanded to accommodate the increasing Asian Pacific Islands immigrant population in the area. This grant covered the period from 1985 to 1988. A concurrent grant funded from 1986 though 1989 also provided the opportunity to infuse multicultural content throughout the Division of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. All of the professors and courses in the Division were able to benefit from this initiative which was also designed and directed by professor Grossman. This mid eighties period turned out to be the high point in the overall development of the program. In 1985 Curriculum Associates also supported the development of a Portuguese translation of The Brigance test. The State of California also funded summer grants to provide in service training for teachers, psychologists and speech and language therapists who work with Southeast Asian students. In 1985 the state also funded the development of a Bilingual Home language inventory for the Filipino, Portuguese, Spanish and Vietnamese components of the program. One final state grant funded the Hispanic culture study which enriched the bicultural capability of the project and resulted in the Publication by Dr. Grossman of a major text in the field of Hispanic culture as related to education.

Another grant in this long series operated from 1989 to 1992 and was funded by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) of the US. Department of Education. A final grant was received from OSERS for the period from 1990 - 1993. This unique three year project supported the utilization of ITSF closed circuit interactive TV transmission to four sites in Northern California. This enabled professor Grossman and his colleagues to reach teachers in more distant locations in four Northern California counties. It also enabled the development of an inter university approach to bilingual special education teacher training.

Through this comprehensive 14 year effort a large number bilingual special education teachers have been trained and placed in California Schools to work with limited English proficient students with disabilities. Thus the quality of assessment and instruction for this unique population of students has been significantly increased during this 14 year period. Some of the graduates have gone on to become trainers of other teachers themselves. An example of this is Candace Clark who is a bilingual special education trainer for the Monterey/Salinas Special Education Local Plan Authority (SELPA) which is located in the Monterey county office of education, and the fine program graduates who have served as faculty members in the program.

The following table summarizes the grant and program development activity just described above.

**Table 1**

**Chronology of Grants and Program Development**

| Year | Project | Languages | Agency |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1979 - 1980 | LH & CD | Spanish | OSERS |
| 1980 - 1983 | LH & CD | Spanish | OSERS |
| 1983 - 1986 | SH, LH, CD | C, F, P, S, V | OSERS |
| 1985 - 1986 | Brigance | Portuguese | State |
| 1985 - 1988 | SE Asian | C, V | State |
| 1986 - 1989 | SE Asian | C, F, P, S, V | OSERS |
| 1989 - 1992 | SH LH CD | C, F, P, S, V | OBEMLA |
| 1990 - 1993 | TV Grant | S P | OSERS |

The Bilingual/Multicultural Special Education Teacher Training Program at San Jose State University today is a model program with a well deserved national reputation. The program has a rich fourteen year history. Established by Dr. Herbert Grossman in 1979 with two faculty members, the program has expanded considerably and now includes eleven bilingual faculty as well as numerous monolingual faculty. It is the largest and most comprehensive program of it's kind in the entire country. The program prepares teachers to work with linguistically and culturally different students with disabilities from Chinese, Filipino, Portuguese, Spanish, and Vietnamese language groups. Specifically the program trains personnel in the credential areas of communications disorders, learning handicapped, and severely handicapped.

The program is delivered both through a standard on campus model as well as through an off campus televised arrangement. The detailed program descriptions have been included in the appendix of this report. The program has been successfully institutionalized over a fourteen year period. The new courses and the new degree emphases have become a regular part of the Division's offerings. Both the Dean of the College of Education and the Chairperson of Special Education have strongly supported the program and are committed to maintaining the program after the Federal support is withdrawn.

**1979-1983 PERIOD**

The Program when it first started focused on training Spanish English Bilingual special education teachers in the areas of Learning Handicapped and Communication Disorders. This evaluator did not have direct contact with the program during this first phase which operated between 1979 and 1983. A great deal of time and energy was devoted to program and course development in this initial phase of the program. The program director and faculty reported that 67 bilingual special education teachers were trained during this period.

**1983-1986 PERIOD**

The second major phase of the program occurred between 1983 and 1986. It was during this time that the program was expanded to include several new language groups including: Chinese; Filipino, Portuguese, and Vietnamese along with Spanish. In addition to the new language groups, the program was also expanded to include an emphasis in the area of the Severely Handicpped along with the Learning Handicapped and

Communication Disordered components. A total of 61 students were trained during this period.

A Mail survey was administered to the students in the program in 1985. A total of 32 of the students in the program responded. During this phase of the program the mean age of the trainees was 33.5. These trainees had an average of six and a half years of teaching experience but only two and half years of experience in working with children with disabilities.

The trainees were asked to rate different aspects of their course work as they related to the various issues of bilingual special education. The basis for their responses was an 18 item Likert type scale with a five point rating system ranging form 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree). All of the responses were between 4 and 5 indicating a high level of satisfaction with the content and outcomes of the various courses in the program.

The summary statement in the evaluation report for this phase of the program was very positive. In part it stated that the bilingual cross-cultural special education program at San Jose State University was very successful . All of the grant objectives were met. The program was well organized and effectively managed. The university administrators supported the program. The students were very pleased with the training they received. The project director did an outstanding job of implementing the program, integrating it within the department and gaining institutional support for it.

**1985-1988 PERIOD**

A Mail survey was also administered to the students in the program in 1988. A total of 18 of the students in the program responded. During this phase of the program the mean age of the trainees had increased from 33.5 to 37.4. The trainees during this period had an average of 9.6 years of experience as compared to the six and a half years of teaching experience in the prior cohort. Experience in Special Education increased slightly from 2.5 years of experience in working with children with disabilities to an average of three years of experience. The ethnic make up of the trainees during this period remained about the same with the exception of the Southeast Asian group which increased considerably during this period.

The summary statement from the 1988 evaluation report stated that the program continued to improve with time. The students during this phase of the program were very pleased with the program. All of the grant objectives were either met or surpassed. The program was described as well organized and effectively managed. The University administration was very supportive of the program as was evidenced by their efforts to recruit a new faculty member for the program. The project director did an outstanding job of gaining faculty and institutional support for the program. The program was described as being a national model as was evidenced by the requests from other institutions for materials and information. The cooperative programs the project initiated with other nearby universities during this period was another one of it's unique accomplishments. A total of 63 students were trained during this period.

**1986-1989 PERIOD**

During this period the bilingual cross-cultural special education training program was serving five different language groups including: Spanish, Filipino, Portuguese, Chinese and Vietnamese. The program was delivered both through a standard on campus model as well as through an off campus television delivery system. The program also received a three year grant from OSER to infuse multicultural competencies into the courses taken by the monolilngual students. During this time period this evaluator did not conduct a site visit. The evaluation was based on course evaluations that were completed by the students at the end of each course.

Based on the data provided on these courses by the students this evaluator concluded that the program was very successful in meeting it's objectives. Special education teachers and speech and language specialists were being prepared to work effectively with limited English proficient students with disabilities. These teachers were not only being taught appropriate content and methodology but they were also being taught in the various target languages of the students they were preparing to working with.

The off campus students who are participating in the closed circuit TV classes were very satisfied with the classes, even though there were a few minor technical problems and/or drawbacks with this delivery system. A few students felt intimidated or inhibited and thus did not participate fully in the class discussions. A review of the student grades indicated that the grades for the on campus students were slightly higher than the off campus TV students.

**1989-1993 PERIOD**

A major programmatic emphasis during this final period was the expansion of the program through an improved use ITFS Closed circuit Television delivery system. A total of 147 trainees participated in this program. Many of the students took their courses on the main campus in studio classrooms where the televised classes were taught and broadcasted. Fifty three students took the Hispanic Learning Handicapped program through interactive television. Because this was the only program of this type in northern California, other colleges and universities in the area agreed to collaborate with San Jose State in offering joint inter university programs which were based on the core courses in bilingual special education offered through the televised distance delivery system. Prior to this evaluators site visit the students in the program were all mailed an evaluation instrument. Twenty seven of the students returned the survey. The results from this survey are summarized below. The complete and more detailed report of these data by each language group have been included in the appendix of this report.

The following table provides summary data reported by all the students during the final year of the project. The students were asked to rate the competencies on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest score and 5 being the highest score. The average ratings are reported. The total number of students varies because not all of the students took all of the courses. As can be seen from the data all the courses were highly rated. Given these high ratings, the lowest at 3.8 was related to the assessment competencies. The highest rating (4.2) was assigned to the practicum course. The complete data summary for each competency item is included in the appendix.

**Table 2**

**MEAN SCORE RATINGS FOR COMPETENCY ATTAINMENT**

| COMPETENCY DOMAIN | MEAN RATING |
|---|---|
| 1. POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF BILINGUAL SP ED | 3.9 |
| 2. CURRICULUM PLANNING FOR BILINGUAL SP ED | 3.9 |
| 3. EDUC ASSESSMENT OF BILINGUAL HANDICAPPED | 3.8 |
| 4. INSTRUCTION OF BILINGUAL HANDICAPPED | 4.0 |
| 5. FIELD PRACTICUM: BILINGUAL SP ED | 4.2 |

The next table provides summary data reported by the Hispanic emphasis students who took the courses through the closed circuit interactive television program. It is based on the program and course competency questionnaire which was distributed during the final year of the project. The students were asked to rate the competencies on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest score and 5 being the highest score. The average ratings are reported. The total number of students varies because not all of the students took all of the courses at the same time. As can be seen from the data, all the courses were highly rated. Given these high ratings the lowest at 3.9 was related to the assessment competencies. The highest rating (4.2) was assigned to the practicum course. The complete data summary for each competency item is included in the appendix.

Table 3

MEAN SCORE RATINGS FOR COMPETENCY ATTAINMENT

| COMPETENCY DOMAIN | MEAN RATING |
|---|---|
| 1. POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF BILINGUAL SP ED | 4.1 |
| 2. CURRICULUM PLANNING FOR BILINGUAL SP ED | 4.0 |
| 3. EDUC ASSESSMENT OF BILINGUAL HANDICAPPED | 3.9 |
| 4. INSTRUCTION OF BILINGUAL HANDICAPPED | 4.1 |
| 5. FIELD PRACTICUM: BILINGUAL SP ED | 4.2 |

The Bilingual special education televised graduate program at San Jose State University was very successful and accomplished all of it's objectives. It was a strong, well developed and effectively administered program. It enjoyed strong student, faculty, and administrative support. Local school districts and community agencies considered it to be a very important part of the University's offerings. It was very highly regarded as a model program by colleagues throughout the country. The three year Masters degree grant which was the basis for this portion of this evaluation contributed significantly to the quality of the program in bilingual special education as well as to the quality of the special education offerings of the Division of Special Education in general. The project director, faculty and the staff made significant contributions to bilingual special education both at the national as well as at the state level in California.

In terms of total numbers of trainees during this fourteen year period, it is estimated that four hundred and twenty nine bilingual special education teachers were trained and became involved in programs serving culturally and linguistically different exceptional children in northern California. The following table summarizes this information.

**Table 4**

**Summary of Students Trained from 1979 -1993**

| Year | Project | Languages | Agency | Trainees |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1979 - 1980 | LH & CD | Spanish | OSERS | 2 1 |
| 1980 - 1983 | LH & CD | Spanish | OSERS | 4 6 |
| 1983 - 1986 | SH, LH, CD | F, P, S, | OSERS | 6 1 |
| 1985 - 1986 | Brigance | Portuguese | Curriculum Associates | NA |
| 1985 - 1988 | SE Asian | Vietnemese | State | 4 7 |
| 1985 - 1988* | SH, LH, CD | C, F, P, S, V | OBEMLA | 1 6 |
| 1986 - 1989 | SH LH CD | C, F, P, S, V | OBEMLA | 6 0 |
| 1986 - 1989 | LH | Multicultural Infusion | OSERS | 31 (all students in the area** |
| 1989 - 1992 | SH, LH, CD | C, F, P, S, V | OBEMLA | 9 4 |
| 1990 - 1993 | TV Grant LH | S, P | OSERS | 53*** |

* Title VII Fellowship Program
** 31 Students received financial support but all students in the LH program were involved in the project.
*** Includes trainees during 1988-1990 prior to receiving the grant.

**SUMMARY**

The Bilingual Cross-cultural Special Education Teacher Training Program at San Jose State University is truly a model program with a strong and well deserved national reputation. The program development which has been summarized in this report has a rich fourteen year history. Established by Dr. Herbert Grossman in 1979 with just two faculty members, the program has seen a great deal of expansion and now includes eleven bilingual faculty as well as numerous monolingual faculty. At the present time it is

the largest and most comprehensive program of it's kind in the entire country. The program prepares teachers to work with linguistically and culturally different students with disabilities from Chinese, Filipino, Portuguese, Spanish, and Vietnamese language groups. Specifically the program now trains personnel in the credential areas of communications disorders, learning handicapped, and severely handicapped.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the data gathered for this 14 year report and on 11 years of personal interaction with the project director, faculty and students in the program, this evaluator makes the following recommendations.

1. Seek additional internal and external sources of support for the program and it's students.
2. Seek funding for the continuation and refinement of the televised component of the program.
3. Continue to increase the emphasis on the research and scholarly activity of the program students and faculty.
4. Seek the input of the special education faculty on how to continue strengthening the multicultural content of the regular courses, in order to more closely integrate the program and better involve regular faculty in the advising and mentoring of the bilingual students.
5. Explore the possibility of offering more service courses to the non-bilingual students in the division.
6. Send lists of recommended books and journals to the University library in order to improve this important resource.
7. Continue to involve faculty and graduate students in presenting papers at national conferences and in authoring joint publications.
8. Closely monitor program graduates and conduct a longitudinal study on their impact in the schools and on LEP handicapped student achievement.
9. Utilize program graduates as mentors and process advisors to current students.
10. Provide follow up support for the program graduates to the extent possible.

11. Encourage the local school districts to employ bilingual special education supervisors with target language and cultural expertise who can provide on going staff development and support for the program.
12. Disseminate information on this successful training model to other colleges and universities throughout the country.